

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/465,530	1	2/16/1999	NOSAKHARE D. OMOIGUI	MS1-362US	8986	
22801	7590	04/22/2004		EXAMINER		
LEE & HA		_	YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO			
	W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 OKANE, WA 99201 ART UNIT PAPER N			PAPER NUMBER		
•			2176	-		

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

1

			/	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/465,530	OMOIGUI, NOSAKHARE D.		
ration, riode.	Examiner	Art Unit	-	
	Almari Yuan	2176		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 06 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	/ to a tion in	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	•		
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	s	
NOTE:				
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	enewly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appl	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•	_		
10. Other:	14	Tull		
	JOS SUPERVISOR	EPH FEILD PATENT EXAMINE	IR	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the art rejections of all claims have been carefully considered but they are not persuasive. Bronson does disclose the claimed invention of seaching the media stream to identify temporal locations that satisfy a certain search criteria; on col. 3, lines 26-29 teaches data from the data index 34 may be searched by the user to determine when a particular word or phrase occurs in the audio-video data stored on the media 12, in other words, allowing the user to determine when a word occurs in an audio-video data stream is the temporal indication, i.e., when the word occurs, is returned to the user. Furthermore, Bronson on col. 2, lines 31-35 teaches "...timing or other position or location data mechanism 20 to continuously indicate the location data unique to the audio-video data being monitored so that individual portions of the data may be identified (searched) for later retrieval and on col. 4, lines 6-12 teaches "timing data may also be provided from the audio-video data. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed on 4/6/04.